

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-13, 15, 16, and 19 are pending in this application.

Applicants have amended claim 1, and have canceled claim 4. The changes to the claims made herein do not introduce any new matter.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-13, 15, 16, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Pop* (US 7,251,058 B2) in view of *Kita et al.* (“*Kita*”) (US 5,502,579) (as noted above, claim 4 has been canceled). As will be explained in more detail below, the combination of *Pop* in view of *Kita* would not have rendered the subject matter defined in independent claim 1, as amended herein, obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to include the features of original claim 4. In light of the changes to claim 1, Applicants have canceled claim 4.

In support of the obviousness rejection of former claim 4, the Examiner asserts that *Pop* discloses the features specified in this claim (which features are included in present claim 1). In particular, the Examiner relies on the disclosure in the *Pop* reference at column 7, lines 7-21 (see the Office Action at pages 9-10). In the portion relied upon by the Examiner, however, the *Pop* reference provides only an ink duty related description, and *Pop* fails to disclose or suggest determining a real ink quantity so that the ink quantity of spot color inks decreases as a lightness parameter value increases, after obtaining a virtual ink quantity.

In addition, *Pop*’s invention is solely intended to design an ICC profile (LUT) with color matching in mind, and *Pop* does not at all suggest one object of the claimed subject matter, namely, reducing the granularity in a high lightness region, which occurs when spot color inks are used. The *Kita* reference does not cure the deficiencies of the *Pop* relative to the subject matter of former claim 4, which is included in present claim 1.

Thus, even if one having ordinary skill in the art were to combine the *Pop* and *Kita* references in the manner proposed by the Examiner, the result of this combination would not have included each and every feature of the subject matter defined in present claim 1. As such, the combination of *Pop* in view of *Kita* would not have rendered the subject matter defined in present claim 1 obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

Furthermore, with regard to the withdrawal of the allowability of former claim 17, the features of which are included in present claim 1, the Examiner alleges that *Kita* discloses the features that the *Pop* reference fails to disclose, namely the reproduction color being “a color reproduced by a provisional color separation ink quantity set derived by multiplying the outermost shell color separation ink quantity set for the outermost shell chromatic color having a same vector as the input color in the primary color space, by a ratio of a length of the input color vector to a length of the outermost shell chromatic color vector.”

The *Kita* reference, however, merely discloses a color signal conversion process with inks corresponding to the claimed chromatic primary color inks, and *Kita* provides no disclosure or suggestion of a color conversion (color separation) technique with the spot color inks that are used in both the claimed configuration and the *Pop* reference. In fact, the *Kita* reference makes no mention of spot color inks. As such, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner’s characterization of the *Kita* reference as satisfying the features of former claim 17 (which features are included in present claim 1) that define the ink separation based on the extended chromatic color obtained by using the spot color inks.

Accordingly, for at least the foregoing reasons, independent claim 1, as amended herein, is patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Pop* in view of *Kita*. Claims 2, 3, 5-13, 15, 16, and 19, each of which ultimately depends from claim 1, are likewise patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of *Pop* in view of *Kita* for at least the same reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of claims 1-3, 5-13, 15, 16, and 19, as amended herein, and submit that these claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at **(408) 749-6902**. If any additional fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, then the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. MIPFP078).

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, L.L.P.

/Peter B. Martine/

Peter B. Martine
Reg. No. 32,043

**710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200
Sunnyvale, California 94085
Customer Number 25920**